

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 2-20, 22 and 23 remain pending, wherein it is proposed to amend claims 4 and 7. Entry of the amendments to claims 4 and 7 are appropriate in the period after the final rejection because the amendments merely change the dependency of these claims and are responsive to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, these amendments do not raise new issues which would require further search and/or consideration.

Initially, it should be noted that a Petition to Withdraw Finality under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 was filed on May 6, 2005. In accordance with a telephone conversation between the Examiner and the undersigned attorney, as of June 6, 2005, the Petition is still being considered. It is respectfully requested that the Petition be considered in a timely manner, and for at least those reasons set forth in the Petition, the finality of the April 28, 2005 Office Action should be withdrawn.

In the sixth paragraph of the Office Action claims 4, 5, 7, 14, 15, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, claims 4 and 7 are rejected as depending upon a canceled claim, and claims 7, 14, 15, 18 and 19 are rejected as depending from either of claims 4 and 7. Claims 4 and 7 have been amended to address this ground of rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

In the seventh paragraph of the Office Action claims 2-11 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

6,882,299 to Allport ("Allport")<sup>1</sup>. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Allport does not anticipate Applicant's claim 2 because Allport does not disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 2. For example, Allport does not disclose a main device which includes an "access destination storage means for storing the identification code of said remote controller device and the access destination in a one-to-one correspondence" as recited in Applicant's claim 2.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 sets forth the law of anticipation. This section, citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987), states that "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." This section of the M.P.E.P. goes on to describe that "[t]he elements [of the prior art reference] must be arranged as required by the claim." *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831 (Fed. Cir. 1990). It is respectfully submitted that Allport does not explicitly or inherently disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 2, arranged as required by the claim.

Allport discloses a portable Internet-enabled controller. Specifically, Allport discloses a remote controller that uses infrared commands to control

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the header of this rejection does not mention claim 6, the body of the rejection references claim 6, the Office Action summary indicates claim 6 is rejected, and there are no other rejections of claim 6 contained in the Office Action. Accordingly, it is assumed that the omission of claim 6 from the header of the rejection is a typographical error. Additionally, the header of the rejection indicated that claims 16-29 are rejected. However, it is believed that this is a typographical error and should be claims 16-20. Specifically, claim 21 is canceled, claims 22 and 23 are rejected under a different grounds of rejection in numbered paragraph 8, and the application does not have claims 24-29.

various consumer appliances and can obtain information from the Internet. The remote control can communicate directly with the devices being controlled, or via a proprietary base stations. Information is obtained from the Internet by connecting the remote control to a home PC or by connecting an internal modem 655 to a phone line. Col. 28, lines 55-63. However, Allport does not disclose that the proprietary base stations or the home PC includes an “access destination storage means for storing the identification code of said remote controller device and the access destination in a one-to-one correspondence” as would be required to anticipate the main device recited in Applicant’s claim 2.

Nevertheless, the Office Action cites col. 9, lines 9-23 of Allport as disclosing the access destination storage means recited in Applicant’s claim 2. This section discusses the “welcome screen” that “will appear on the display of the remote control 10.” (Col. 9, lines 11-12) (emphasis added). This section goes on to describe that the if a password or other log-on means are required, a proper password or other log-on means must be entered in order for the “welcome screen” to be displayed. However, this section only discusses the remote control and does not discuss a main device, nor is there any discussion of storing an identification code and an access destination in a one-to-one correspondence. Accordingly, this section cannot disclose a main device which includes an “access destination storage means for storing the identification code of said remote controller device and the access destination in a one-to-one correspondence” as recited in Applicant’s claim 2.

Because Allport does not disclose each and every element of Applicant's claim 2, arranged in the manner required by claim 2, Allport cannot anticipate Applicant's claim 2.

Claims 2-5, 7-11 and 16-19 variously depend from claim 2, and are, therefore, not anticipated by Allport for at least those reasons stated above with regard to claim 2.

Allport does not anticipate Applicant's claim 6 because Allport does not disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 6. For example, Allport does not disclose that "said information sending means of said main device sends the information to said remote controller device at an information sending destination after appending the identification code of said remote controller device to the information." Additionally, Allport does not disclose that "said remote controller device further includes display disabling means for, when the information sent from said main device to said display means is not appended with its own identification code, disabling display of the information."

To reject the information sending means of the main device sending information after appending the identification code, the Office Action cites col. 24, line 58 through col. 25, line 5 of Allport. This section describes the "other" screen 40, which can provide control of kitchen appliances, a web browser, security system or a baby monitor. However, there is nothing in this section which discloses appending an identification code to information. Accordingly, this section cannot disclose that "said information sending means of said main device sends the information to said remote controller device at an information

sending destination after appending the identification code of said remote controller device to the information” as recited in Applicant’s claim 6.

To reject the remote controller device including a display disabling means, the Office Action again cites col. 24, line 58 through col. 25, line 5 of Allport, which as discussed above merely describes the “other” screen 40. However, there is nothing in this section which even mentions disabling a display of a remote control or main device. Accordingly, this section cannot disclose that that “said remote controller device further includes display disabling means for, when the information sent from said main device to said display means is not appended with its own identification code, disabling display of the information” as recited in Applicant’s claim 6.

Because Allport does not disclose all of the elements of Applicant’s claim 6, arranged in the same manner recited in the claim, Allport cannot anticipate Applicant’s claim 6.

Claim 20 depends from claim 6, and accordingly, claim 20 is not anticipated by Allport for at least those reasons stated above with regard to Applicant’s claim 6.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2-11 and 16-19 as being anticipated by Allport be withdrawn.

In the eighth paragraph of the Office Action claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,772,394 to Kamada (“Kamada”). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kamada does not anticipate Applicant's claim 22 because Kamada does not disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 22. For example, Kamada does not disclose the act of "disabling the output to the display device when it is determined that the output is not allowed." Additionally, Kamada does not disclose the act of "receiving, by the main device from the portable remote controller device, a display switching signal," where the main device stores a setting based on the display switching signal and the determination of whether an output to the display device is allowed is based on the stored setting.

Kamada discloses a television device that assigns operation buttons of a remote controller to hot spots on a given home-page of the Internet. However, Kamada does not discuss disabling an output to a display device coupled to a main device. Accordingly, Kamada cannot disclose disabling the output when it is determined that such output is not allowed or receiving a display switching signal, where the determination that such output is not allowed is based on a stored setting, which is set based on the received display switching signal.

Nevertheless, to reject the aforementioned disabling act of Applicant's claim 22, the Office Action cites col. 7, lines 34-48 of Kamada. This section of Kamada discusses that a telephone number of a provider, ID number and password of a user, stored in RAM 23, are read out to establish a connection between the television device and the provider. However, there is nothing in this section which even mentions disabling an output to a display device. Accordingly, this section cannot disclose the act of "disabling the output to the

display device when it is determined that the output is not allowed” as recited in Applicant’s claim 22.

To reject the aforementioned receiving act of Applicant’s claim 22, the Office Action cites col. 7, lines 49-58 of Kamada. This section discusses that, during a connected state, when the SELECT button is depressed while the NAVIGATOR characters on the screen are highlighted, the navigator program is activated and an initial home page screen is displayed. However, Kamada does not disclose that the SELECT button is a display switching signal that is received by a main device, where the main device stores a setting based on the display switching signal, and the determination of whether an output to the display is allowed is based on the stored setting. Accordingly, this section of Kamada does not disclose receiving a display switching signal, where the display switching signal is used for storing a setting and such setting is used for determining whether output to the display device is allowed, as recited in Applicant’s claim 22.

Claim 23 depends from claim 22, and accordingly, is not anticipated by Kamada for at least those reasons stated above with regard to claim 22.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 22 and 23 as being anticipated by Kamada be withdrawn.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 038849.49341).

July 28, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffrey D. Sanok", is written over a horizontal line.

Jeffrey D. Sanok  
Registration No. 32,169  
Stephen W. Palan  
Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING, LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JDS:SWP  
#384301